



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/673,288	12/07/2000	Laurent Chevalet	PF83PCTSEQ/D	3732

25666 7590 04/20/2004

THE FIRM OF HUESCHEN AND SAGE
500 COLUMBIA PLAZA
350 EAST MICHIGAN AVENUE
KALAMAZOO, MI 49007

EXAMINER

KATCHEVES, KONSTANTINA T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1636

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SM

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/673,288	CHEVALET ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Konstantina Katcheves	1636	

All Participants:

(1) Konstantina Katcheves.

(2) Patrick Sage.

Date of Interview: 12 March 2004
15 April 2004
July 2003

Status of Application: _____

(3) Dianne Newton.

(4) _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
NA

Claims discussed:
NA

Prior art documents discussed:
NA

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Konstantina Katcheves
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In July 2003, the Examiner was informed by applicant's representative that the sequence compliance letter mailed 6/17/2003 was in error because substitute specification pages providing SEQ ID NOs were filed with the amendment of 8/28/2001. These papers were found in the back of the application file and were indicated as not entered in the amendment. The examiner had the art unit LIE enter the specification pages. However, page 1 of the 8/28/2001 amendment still indicates that these amendments were not entered. This is in error; the amendments were in fact entered in July 2003. Since July 2003, the Office converted to image file wrappers. During the scanning process, the specification pages filed 8/28/2001 were not scanned into the application. The examiner, on 4/15/2004 requested copies of these pages from Patrick Sage which were immediately faxed to the examiner. These pages have been submitted for scanning. An office action in the present application is forthcoming. The examiner appreciates Applicant's patience and Applicant's representative's assistance in resolving this matter..